DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: 31 Livesay Crescent WB/11/0132/FULL

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 7.12.2010

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property comprises a traditional hipped-roof bungalow located on the west side of Livesay Crescent. The bungalow has previously been enlarged by a flat-roofed rear extension, rear conservatory and car port on the north side.

The locality is characterised by a diverse range of dwelling types including a mix of traditional bungalows, detached and semi-detached houses. Hipped roofs, bay windows and gable features are unifying elements of the surrounding built form which lend some degree of visual cohesion.

Permission is sought for rooms in the roof involving hip-to-gable roof extensions and 2 pitched-roof rear dormers, a flat-roofed side extension and a flat-roofed rear extension to replace the existing conservatory. The additional accommodation would consist of 2 additional bedrooms and a bathroom, an enlarged lounge and utility room and attached store in place of the existing car port.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Planning permission was refused on 7 January 2001 under WB/10/0952/FULL for a first-floor extension, replacement rear extension, single-storey side extension (north elevation) and new pitched roof over existing rear extension, on the following grounds:-

1. The proposed extensions and alterations, by reason of their size, scale, shape, design and massing would be poorly related in visual terms to the existing dwelling and would appear as an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development that would detract from the integrity of the existing architectural composition, and be detrimental to the character and visual cohesiveness of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CC6 and BE1 of the South East Plan, 'saved' policies H16 and BE1 of the Worthing Local Plan and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or Altering Your Home'.

2. Cumulatively, the effect of the proposed extensions and alterations, by reason of their overall 'bulk', height, siting and proximity to the boundary would have an unduly dominant, overbearing and overshadowing effect on the south-facing windows and conservatory of No.14 Cecilian Avenue and would unacceptably detract from the residential amenities of the occupiers

thereof. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CC6 of the South East Plan, 'saved' policies H16 and H18 of the Worthing Local Plan, and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or Altering Your Home'.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Worthing Local Plan: H16, H18, BE1 and SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home'
South East Plan: CC6, BE1
Core Strategy: Policy 16

RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

None

REPRESENTATIONS

None

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The proposal would constitute improvement of the existing housing stock and can be supported in principle. The relevant considerations are the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality.

The effects on the appearance of the dwelling and surrounding streetscene
The earlier refused proposal involved building up the outer walls of the original bungalow together with the addition of a new, taller part-hipped, part gabled roof together with raised eaves and first-floor dormers 'breaking through' the eaves at the front and rear. It is now proposed to enlarge the existing hipped roof with hip-to-gabled roof extensions on either side, but retaining the existing 40° angle of pitch and the existing twin gabled bay window features which are key unifying elements within the streetscene.

Given the diversity of buildings types in the immediate locality, with bungalows interspersed amongst houses, it would be difficult to argue that the additional 'bulk' created by the proposed roof extensions would appear out of keeping notwithstanding the forward position of the application property in relation to the smaller scale detached bungalow on the corner to the north, No.14 Cecilian Avenue.

Unfortunately, the overall integrity of appearance is undermined by the unbalanced position of the dormers on the rear roof slope, of which there would be glimpsed views from Cecilian Avenue through the gaps between the bungalows. Following discussions an amended drawing has been received showing the slight re-positioning of both dormers to achieve a more balanced appearance.

There is no objection to the small roofllight on the front slope.

The proposed flat-roofed side extension would replace the existing car port attached to the north side of the existing bungalow. It has a rather unsympathetic, utilitarian appearance but is now shown set back 1.1 metres from the front wall of the bungalow, compared to 0.2 metres previously, and would be less visually prominent within the streetscene.

There is no objection to the proposed flat-roofed rear extension (replacing the existing conservatory to the same depth) which would not be visible from the street.

Effect on living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

The main impact is on the adjoining property to the north, No.14 Cecilian Avenue, comprising a detached bungalow occupying a wide, but shallow corner plot on the west side of the junction with Livesay Crescent. The original bungalow has been enlarged by a conservatory on the east side and by an attached annexe (formerly a garage) on the west side. There is a gap of only 1m between the southern rear elevation and the site boundary with No.31. There are a number of windows serving habitable rooms in this elevation. The outlook from these rooms and the amount of daylight/sunlight is somewhat restricted by the height and proximity of the adjacent boundary fence. In refusing the earlier scheme, it was considered the combination of the increased height and bulkier part-gabled form of the proposed enlarged dwelling, together with the siting and proximity of the proposed side extension and formation of a pitched-roof over the existing flat-roofed rear element would have a dominant and overbearing effect, increasing the extent of overshadowing and substantially reducing the amount of daylight and visible skyline, particularly to the 2 eastern-most windows in the original house, and the glazed south side of the attached conservatory.

The current proposals involve less additional 'bulk' with no increase in the overall height of the roof (and with the extension of the pitched-roof over the existing flat roofed rear extension omitted). Consequently, although there would be some additional impact on daylight to, and outlook from, the 2 eastern-most windows and south side of the conservatory at No.14, the effect would not now be so severe as to warrant refusal on this ground alone.

The flank wall of No.29, a detached 2-storey house, is sited approximately 1m from the southern side boundary of No.31. The first-floor windows in this elevation appear to serve non-habitable rooms and although the increased 'bulk' of the proposed hip to gable roof extension would have some impact on daylight, the effect would be limited. A glazed lean-to porch built onto the common boundary is fitted with obscure-glass. The increased bulk of the enlarged dwelling and replacement single-storey rear extension would have only a limited impact on daylighting to the lean-to.

RECOMMENDATION APPROVE subject to:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Matching materials

4. No windows in side walls

REASON FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with 'saved' policies BE1, H16 and H18 of the Worthing Local Plan, policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy and policies CC1, CC6 and BE1 of the South East Plan.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

No

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign.....[redacted].....Date.....6·5·11.....

Authorising Offic[redacted]
Sign.....[redacted].....Date.....8.5.11.....